



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,541	07/16/2003	John M. Hecklinger	023880-4	5955

22204 7590 08/23/2005

NIXON PEABODY, LLP  
401 9TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 900  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128

EXAMINER
----------

ARTHUR JEANGLAUDE, GERTRUDE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3661

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/619,541

Applicant(s)

HECKLINGER, JOHN M.

Examiner

Gertrude Arthur-Jeanglaude

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9,10,16 and 21-38 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8,11-15 and 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 11-15, 17-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al. (U.S. Pub 2002/0194051) in view of Office of Defects Investigation (<http://www-odi.nhtsa.dot.gov/cars/problems/recalls>) and further in view of Joao (US 20020016655).

As to claims 1, 11, 17, Hall et al. disclose a method for generating and displaying information relating to a vehicle's history, comprising the steps of: identifying records in a database that relate to a particular vehicle, the records containing data relating to the vehicle's history (See Fig.3C; abstract); However, Hall et al. fail to specifically disclose that the records include a reliability issue record indicating that a reliability issue exists for the particular vehicle. In an analogous art, the office of defects investigation disclose a system with reliability issue record (recall) (See page 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Hall et al. with that of office of defects investigation in order to provide data on the vehicle. The prior art do not specifically disclose a particular vehicle and a vehicle manufacturer.

Art Unit: 2144

In an analogous art, Joao discloses a vehicle information and maintenance information wherein it discloses a vehicle manufacturer and vehicle information (See paragraph 0177, 0184). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Hall et al. and that of reference "the office of defects investigation" with the system of Joao by having a particular vehicle and a vehicle manufacturer in order to communicate the vehicle state information.

As to claims 2, 12, 18, Hall et al. disclose the step of determining whether the database should contain reliability issue information includes determining whether a manufacturer of the vehicle provides data for inclusion in the database (See Fig. 1; abstract).

As to claims 3, 13, 19, Hall et al. disclose the step of determining whether the manufacturer of the vehicle provides data for inclusion in the database includes accessing : look-up table listing (considered as to do list) (See Fig.6) vehicle manufacturers providing data for inclusion in said database and determining whether the manufacturer of the vehicle is listed in the look-up table.

As to claims 4-5, 7-8, 15 Hall et al. all but fail to specifically disclose the file is related to the absence of a reliability issue includes a no open recall file indicates that no recalls are open for repair. On the other hand, office of defects investigation discloses on page 1 the recall process wherein it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have open recall, reliability issue for safety involving the vehicles.

As to claims 6,14, 20 Hall et al. disclose a display as discussed and a vehicle identification number associated with the particular vehicle (See abstract; Fig.6).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 9-10, 16, 21, 22-38 are allowed.

The prior art fails to disclose a method for generating and displaying import compliance information relating to a vehicle's history comprising ; determining whether a first title registration record relating to a particular vehicle indicate the vehicle originated in a first country; and determining whether a second title registration record subsequent to the first title registration record during the vehicle's history, indicates at least one of a titling and a registration in a second country; determining whether an import record exists that indicates compliance with import standards of the second country at a time during the history of the vehicle after the first title registration record; if no import record relating to the second country exists after the first and second title registration records, then displaying an electronically displayable first import advisory file related to the vehicle not meeting import standards of the second country.

The prior art fails to disclose whether a first title registration record relating to a particular vehicle indicate the vehicle originated in a first country; and determining

Art Unit: 2144

whether a second title registration record subsequent to the first title registration record during the vehicle's history, indicates at least one of a titling and a registration in a second country; determining whether an import record exists that indicates compliance with import standards of the second country at a time during the history of the vehicle after the first title registration record; if no import record relating to the second country exists after the first and second title registration records, then displaying an electronically displayable first import advisory file related to the vehicle not meeting import standards of the second country.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2144

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gertrude Arthur-Jeanglaude whose telephone number is (571) 272-6954. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m..


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on (571) 272-3925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GAJ



August 19, 2005

  
GERTRUDE A. JEANGLAUDE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER